

CENTER FOR DISABILITY ACCESS  
Amanda Seabock, Esq., SBN 289900  
Prathima Price, Esq., SBN 321378  
Dennis Price, Esq., SBN 279082  
Mail: 8033 Linda Vista Road, Suite 200  
San Diego, CA 92111  
(858) 375-7385; (888) 422-5191 fax  
[amandas@potterhandy.com](mailto:amandas@potterhandy.com)

Attorneys for Plaintiff

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

**Jose Estrada,**  
Plaintiff,

v.

**McLaughlin Supermarket, Inc.,** a  
California Corporation  
Defendants.

**Case No.**

**Complaint For Damages And  
Injunctive Relief For Violations  
Of: Americans With Disabilities  
Act; Unruh Civil Rights Act**

Plaintiff Jose Estrada complains of McLaughlin Supermarket, Inc., a California Corporation; and alleges as follows:

**PARTIES:**

1. Plaintiff is a California resident with physical disabilities. He is a paraplegic who cannot walk and who uses a wheelchair for mobility.
2. Defendant McLaughlin Supermarket, Inc. owned Story Supermarket located at or about 1200 Story Rd., San Jose, California, in February 2022.
3. Defendant McLaughlin Supermarket, Inc. owns Story Supermarket ("Store") located at or about 1200 Story Rd., San Jose, California, currently.
4. Plaintiff does not know the true names of Defendants, their business

1 capacities, their ownership connection to the property and business, or their  
2 relative responsibilities in causing the access violations herein complained of,  
3 and alleges a joint venture and common enterprise by all such Defendants.  
4 Plaintiff is informed and believes that each of the Defendants herein is  
5 responsible in some capacity for the events herein alleged, or is a necessary  
6 party for obtaining appropriate relief. Plaintiff will seek leave to amend when  
7 the true names, capacities, connections, and responsibilities of the Defendants  
8 are ascertained.

9  
10 **JURISDICTION & VENUE:**

11 5. The Court has subject matter jurisdiction over the action pursuant to 28  
12 U.S.C. § 1331 and § 1343(a)(3) & (a)(4) for violations of the Americans with  
13 Disabilities Act of 1990, 42 U.S.C. § 12101, et seq.

14 6. Pursuant to supplemental jurisdiction, an attendant and related cause  
15 of action, arising from the same nucleus of operative facts and arising out of  
16 the same transactions, is also brought under California's Unruh Civil Rights  
17 Act, which act expressly incorporates the Americans with Disabilities Act.

18 7. Venue is proper in this court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b) and is  
19 founded on the fact that the real property which is the subject of this action is  
20 located in this district and that Plaintiff's cause of action arose in this district.

21  
22 **FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS:**

23 8. Plaintiff went to the Store in February 2022 with the intention to avail  
24 himself of its goods or services motivated in part to determine if the  
25 defendants comply with the disability access laws.

26 9. The Store is a facility open to the public, a place of public  
27 accommodation, and a business establishment.

28 10. Unfortunately, on the date of the plaintiff's visit, the defendants failed

1 to provide wheelchair accessible paths of travel in conformance with the ADA  
2 Standards as it relates to wheelchair users like the plaintiff.

3 11. The Store provides paths of travel to its customers but fails to provide  
4 wheelchair accessible paths of travel in conformance with the ADA Standards.

5 12. A problem that plaintiff encountered was that the paths of travel inside  
6 the Store narrowed to less than 36 inches in width in many places.

7 13. Plaintiff believes that there are other features of the paths of travel that  
8 likely fail to comply with the ADA Standards and seeks to have fully compliant  
9 paths of travel for wheelchair users.

10 14. On information and belief, the defendants currently fail to provide  
11 wheelchair accessible paths of travel.

12 15. Additionally, on the date of the plaintiff's visit, the defendants failed to  
13 provide wheelchair accessible produce weight scales in conformance with the  
14 ADA Standards as it relates to wheelchair users like the plaintiff.

15 16. The Store provides produce weight scales to its customers but fails to  
16 provide wheelchair accessible produce weight scales in conformance with the  
17 ADA Standards.

18 17. One problem that plaintiff encountered was that the produce weight  
19 scales were too high.

20 18. Plaintiff believes that there are other features of the produce weight  
21 scales that likely fail to comply with the ADA Standards and seeks to have fully  
22 compliant produce weight scales for wheelchair users.

23 19. On information and belief, the defendants currently fail to provide  
24 wheelchair accessible produce weight scales.

25 20. The failure to provide accessible facilities created difficulty and  
26 discomfort for the Plaintiff.

27 21. These barriers relate to and impact the plaintiff's disability. Plaintiff  
28 personally encountered these barriers.

1       22. As a wheelchair user, the plaintiff benefits from and is entitled to use  
2 wheelchair accessible facilities. By failing to provide accessible facilities, the  
3 defendants denied the plaintiff full and equal access.

4       23. The defendants have failed to maintain in working and useable  
5 conditions those features required to provide ready access to persons with  
6 disabilities.

7       24. The barriers identified above are easily removed without much  
8 difficulty or expense. They are the types of barriers identified by the  
9 Department of Justice as presumably readily achievable to remove and, in fact,  
10 these barriers are readily achievable to remove. Moreover, there are numerous  
11 alternative accommodations that could be made to provide a greater level of  
12 access if complete removal were not achievable.

13       25. Plaintiff will return to the Store to avail himself of its goods or services  
14 and to determine compliance with the disability access laws once it is  
15 represented to him that the Store and its facilities are accessible. Plaintiff is  
16 currently deterred from doing so because of his knowledge of the existing  
17 barriers and his uncertainty about the existence of yet other barriers on the  
18 site. If the barriers are not removed, the plaintiff will face unlawful and  
19 discriminatory barriers again.

20       26. Given the obvious and blatant nature of the barriers and violations  
21 alleged herein, the plaintiff alleges, on information and belief, that there are  
22 other violations and barriers on the site that relate to his disability. Plaintiff will  
23 amend the complaint, to provide proper notice regarding the scope of this  
24 lawsuit, once he conducts a site inspection. However, please be on notice that  
25 the plaintiff seeks to have all barriers related to his disability remedied. See  
26 *Doran v. 7-11*, 524 F.3d 1034 (9th Cir. 2008) (holding that once a plaintiff  
27 encounters one barrier at a site, he can sue to have all barriers that relate to his  
28 disability removed regardless of whether he personally encountered them).

**I. FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION: VIOLATION OF THE AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT OF 1990** (On behalf of Plaintiff and against all Defendants.) (42 U.S.C. section 12101, et seq.)

27. Plaintiff re-pleads and incorporates by reference, as if fully set forth again herein, the allegations contained in all prior paragraphs of this complaint.

28. Under the ADA, it is an act of discrimination to fail to ensure that the privileges, advantages, accommodations, facilities, goods and services of any place of public accommodation is offered on a full and equal basis by anyone who owns, leases, or operates a place of public accommodation. See 42 U.S.C. § 12182(a). Discrimination is defined, inter alia, as follows:

- a. A failure to make reasonable modifications in policies, practices, or procedures, when such modifications are necessary to afford goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages, or accommodations to individuals with disabilities, unless the accommodation would work a fundamental alteration of those services and facilities. 42 U.S.C. § 12182(b)(2)(A)(ii).
- b. A failure to remove architectural barriers where such removal is readily achievable. 42 U.S.C. § 12182(b)(2)(A)(iv). Barriers are defined by reference to the ADA Standards.
- c. A failure to make alterations in such a manner that, to the maximum extent feasible, the altered portions of the facility are readily accessible to and usable by individuals with disabilities, including individuals who use wheelchairs or to ensure that, to the maximum extent feasible, the path of travel to the altered area and the bathrooms, telephones, and drinking fountains serving the altered area, are readily accessible to and usable by individuals with disabilities. 42 U.S.C. § 12183(a)(2).

1 29. When a business provides paths of travel, it must provide accessible  
2 paths of travel.

3 30. Here, accessible paths of travel have not been provided in conformance  
4 with the ADA Standards.

5 31. When a business provides produce weight scales, it must provide  
6 accessible produce weight scales.

7 32. Here, accessible produce weight scales have not been provided in  
8 conformance with the ADA Standards.

9 33. The Safe Harbor provisions of the 2010 Standards are not applicable  
10 here because the conditions challenged in this lawsuit do not comply with the  
11 1991 Standards.

12 34. A public accommodation must maintain in operable working condition  
13 those features of its facilities and equipment that are required to be readily  
14 accessible to and usable by persons with disabilities. 28 C.F.R. § 36.211(a).

15 35. Here, the failure to ensure that the accessible facilities were available  
16 and ready to be used by the plaintiff is a violation of the law.

17  
18 **II. SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION: VIOLATION OF THE UNRUH CIVIL**  
19 **RIGHTS ACT** (On behalf of Plaintiff and against all Defendants.) (Cal. Civ.  
20 Code § 51-53.)

21 36. Plaintiff repleads and incorporates by reference, as if fully set forth  
22 again herein, the allegations contained in all prior paragraphs of this  
23 complaint. The Unruh Civil Rights Act (“Unruh Act”) guarantees, inter alia,  
24 that persons with disabilities are entitled to full and equal accommodations,  
25 advantages, facilities, privileges, or services in all business establishment of  
26 every kind whatsoever within the jurisdiction of the State of California. Cal.  
27 Civ. Code §51(b).

28 37. The Unruh Act provides that a violation of the ADA is a violation of the

1 Unruh Act. Cal. Civ. Code, § 51(f).

2 38. Defendants' acts and omissions, as herein alleged, have violated the  
3 Unruh Act by, inter alia, denying, or aiding, or inciting the denial of, Plaintiff's  
4 rights to full and equal use of the accommodations, advantages, facilities,  
5 privileges, or services offered.

6 39. Because the violation of the Unruh Civil Rights Act resulted in difficulty,  
7 discomfort or embarrassment for the plaintiff, the defendants are also each  
8 responsible for statutory damages, i.e., a civil penalty. (Civ. Code § 55.56(a)-  
9 (c).

10  
11 **PRAYER:**

12 Wherefore, Plaintiff prays that this Court award damages and provide  
13 relief as follows:

14 1. For injunctive relief, compelling Defendants to comply with the  
15 Americans with Disabilities Act and the Unruh Civil Rights Act. Note: the  
16 plaintiff is not invoking section 55 of the California Civil Code and is not  
17 seeking injunctive relief under the Disabled Persons Act at all.


18 2. For equitable nominal damages for violation of the ADA. See  
19 Uzuegbunam v. Preczewski, --- U.S. ---, 2021 WL 850106 (U.S. Mar. 8, 2021)  
20 and any other equitable relief the Court sees fit to grant.

21 3. Damages under the Unruh Civil Rights Act, which provides for actual  
22 damages and a statutory minimum of \$4,000 for each offense.

23 4. Reasonable attorney fees, litigation expenses and costs of suit, pursuant  
24 to 42 U.S.C. § 12205; and Cal. Civ. Code §§ 52.

1 Dated: March 1, 2022

CENTER FOR DISABILITY ACCESS

2  
3 By:   
4

5 Amanda Seabock, Esq.  
6 Attorney for plaintiff  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28